REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 are presently active in this case. The present Amendment amends Claims 1, 3-7 and 9-11 and adds new Claims 12-20 without introducing any new matter.

The outstanding Office Action rejected Claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Foladare et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,905,777, herein "Foladare").

To correct minor formalities, Claim 1 is amended to recite "is configured to identify" and the "processor is further configured to retrieve." Further, Claims 3-7 and 9-11 are amended to correct minor formalities. Since all the changes to Claims 1, 3-7 and 9-11 are only formal in nature, they are not believed to raise any question of new matter.

To vary the scope of protection recited in the claims, new Claims 12-20 are added. New Claim 12 depends upon Claim 1 and recites features regarding a protocol converter.[1] New Claim 13 depends upon Claim 1 and recited features regarding a data of the database.[2] New Claim 14 depends upon Claim 13 and recites that "the schedule includes time frames at which the user is located in the communication network."[3] New Claim 15 depends upon Claim 1 and recites "a data of the database includes information on services."[4] New Claim 16 depends upon Claim 15 and recites features regarding the information on services.[5] New Claim 17 depends upon Claim 1 and recites features regarding communication link between the services and a proxy mechanism.[6] New Claim 18 depends upon Claim 1 and recites features regarding an I/O controller.[7] New Claim 19 depends upon Claim 18 and recites "the communications between components of the network include receiving and sending the

---

[1] Finds support in Applicants' Specification from page 9, line 29 to page 10, line 1 and in Figure 4.
[2] Finds support in Applicants' Specification at page 10, lines 23-29 and in corresponding Figure 5A.
[3] Finds support in Applicants' Specification at page 10, lines 10-15 and in corresponding Figure 5A.
[4] Finds support in Applicants' Specification at page 10, lines 23-25 and in original Claim 6.
[5] Finds support in Applicants' Specification at page 10, lines 23-29.
[6] Finds support in Applicants' Specification at page 9, lines 7-10.
[7] Finds support in Applicants' Specification at page 9, lines 29-31.

service request messages."[8] New Claim 20 depends upon Claim 11 and recites features

regarding storing information in the database.[9] Since the new claims find non-limiting

support in the disclosure as originally filed, the claims are not believed to raise a question of

new matter.[10]

In response to the rejection of Claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Foladare,

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this rejection and traverse the rejection, as

discussed next.

Briefly recapitulating, Claim 1 relates to a device in a communication network having

multiple sub-networks, where each of the sub-networks includes services that may be

different from that of other sub-networks, including an information processor configured to

receive a service request message from a first sub-network, and an information database. The

service-request message includes information on a service to be executed, and the

information processor is further configured to identify the service. The information processor

retrieves sub-networks available to provide the service requested, and initiates a message to

establish a communication link with at least one of the identified services that are capable of

providing the service. Independent Claim 11 recites similar features in the context of a

method for identifying a sub-network.

As explained in Applicants' specification from page 4, line 30 to page 5, line 7 with

corresponding Figures 2-4, Applicants' invention improves upon background communication

networks having multiple sub-networks because the claimed device provides seamless and

efficient communication of services between different constituent parts of a network and

inefficient accessibility of services from users of a different network can be prevented.

---

[8] Finds support in Applicants' Specification at page 9, lines 29-31.
[9] Finds support in Applicants' Specification at page 11, lines 5-8.
[10] See MPEP 2163.06 stating that "information contained in any one of the specification, claims or drawings of the application as filed may be added to any other part of the application without introducing new matter."

Turning now to the applied reference, the <u>Foladare</u> patent discloses a communication system including an E-mail server and an E-mail network, in which useful E-Mail messages can be identified, separated from junk mail, and forwarded as directed by the recipient.[11] However, <u>Foladare</u> fails to teach "an information processor configured to receive a service request message from a first sub-network, said service-request message indicating a service to be executed," and the "information processor is configured to identify the service." <u>Foladare</u> teaches that "E-mail messages are transmitted over an E-Mail network routed to an E-Mail server servicing the recipient, where useful E-Mail messages can be identified, separated from the junk mail, and forwarded as directed by the recipient."[12] Accordingly, the E-Mail message of <u>Foladare</u> *does not* include information on a service to be executed. This would require that <u>Foladare</u>'s E-Mails would inform the E-Mail server whether the E-Mail is junk mail or not, which is certainly not the case. On the contrary, <u>Foladare</u> explicitly teaches that the E-Mail server receives an E-Mail message and then accesses the recipient's record from the database. Further, <u>Foladare</u>'s step 406 determines if the sender ID 233 in the received message 239 matches any of the senders in the sender list 252 of the recipient's record.[13] An E-Mail server managing incoming E-Mails, as taught by <u>Foladare</u>, *is not* a service-request message indicating a service to be executed.

Further, Applicants respectfully disagree that dependent Claim 7 is anticipated by <u>Foladare</u>.[14] The E-Mail server of <u>Foladare</u> does not establish a connection with another sub-network that is different from a sub-network *from which the service request message is initiated*.

Therefore, the applied reference fails to teach or suggest every feature recited in Applicants' claims, so that Claims 1-11 are patentably distinct over <u>Foladare</u>. Accordingly,

---

[11] See <u>Foladare</u> in the Abstract.
[12] See <u>Foladare</u> at column 1, lines 43-46.
[13] See <u>Foladare</u> from column 4, line 65 to column 5, line 10.
[14] See outstanding Office Action from page 3, line 20 to page 4, line 2.

Applicants respectfully traverse, and request reconsideration of, the rejection based on Foladare.[15]

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal Allowance. A Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-20 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599
Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423

22850

Tel. (703) 413-3000
Fax (703) 413-2220
GJM/SNS/NPS
I:\ATTY\NS\02867\215236US\215236US-AM1-DRAFT1.DOC

---

[15] See MPEP 2131: "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference," (Citations omitted) (emphasis added). See also MPEP 2143.03: "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art."